UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,781	11/03/2000	Richard James Humpleman	SAM1.0014A	4957

7590 08/12/2004

KENNETH L SHERMAN, ESQ.
MYERS DAWES ANDRAS & SHERMAN, LLP
19900 MacARTHUR BLVD., SUITE 1150
IRVINE,, CA 92612

EXAMINER	
BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/709,781	HUMPLEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *5/10/2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *13-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *13-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 5/10/2004, to the original application and pre-amendment A (paper 3), both filed 11/30/2000, said application is a division of United States Application Serial No. 09/104,297 filed 6/24/1998 (pending), with acknowledged provisional application filing dates of 9/22/1997, and **6/25/1997**. IDS filed 11/30/2000 (paper 2), and 6/11/2002 (paper 6).

2. Claims 13, 21-22, 30-31, 39-40, 48 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, T. et al.

3. Claims 14-20, 23-29, 32-38, 41-47 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, T. et al., and Venkatraman et al.

4. Claims 13-48 are pending. Claims 13, 22, 31, 40 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 13, 21-22, 30-31, 39-40, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, T. et al. (hereinafter Suzuki), Teleoperation of multiple robots through the Internet, 5th IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Communication, November 11-14, 1996, pages 84-89.**

In regard to independent claim 13, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 13 "*A method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 13 "*(a) detecting devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01", and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose "menu creation" for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 13 "*(b) creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to activate said controllable function;*", and "*(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually*

select each device and activate said controllable function."). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics aiding in a user's eventual decision.

In regard to dependent claim 21, claim 21 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki's browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

In regard to independent claim 22, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 22 "*A method for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices. Suzuki also teaches "Robot's Status Panel" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 22 "*(a) detecting an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of

robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01", and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 22 "*(b) creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to activate said controllable function;*", and "*(c) displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function.*"). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's decision.

In regard to dependent claim 30, claim 30 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki's browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current active status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

In regard to independent claim 31, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since

it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 31 "*A home network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 31 "*a detector that detects devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01", and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 31 "*a menu generator for creating a menu for individually selecting each of said devices to activate said controllable function;*", and "*a browser for displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function.*"). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's decision.

In regard to dependent claim 39, claim 39 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki's browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

In regard to independent claim 40, Suzuki teaches a graphical interface for accessing a plurality of robot devices located in a room, connected via the Internet, and wireless LAN, to various operators (Suzuki Abstract, also Suzuki page 87 left column - item 4, and Figures 2, 3, 4). The limitation of a home network would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, due to Suzuki's teaching of a graphical room with objects (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), said room disclosed as a room in a plant (factory) (Suzuki page 88 left column – near top). The above teachings suggest a room in a home, since it is typical for rooms in a factory to permanently and/or temporarily house people as necessary, providing Suzuki the benefit of remote operation of devices in a variety of environments (compare with claim 40 "*A home network system for providing an interface for accessing devices that are currently connected to a home network, the method comprising the steps of:*").

Suzuki teaches display of current images from two currently (actively) connected robot devices via a Web browser interface, said interface containing buttons for controlling the direction of said robot devices. Suzuki also teaches "Robot's Status Panel" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4; compare with claim 40 "*(a) a detector that detects an active state of devices that are currently connected to the home network, said devices having at least one controllable function;*").

Suzuki teaches a browser device interface depicting images from two robot devices in a room. Suzuki also teaches a "Dialogue Window" for entering commands to a particular device identified via identifiers (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4, also column 2 near middle - "**CmCd01", and page 88 Figure 6). Suzuki's method of robot query using wildcards (as taught by Suzuki page 87 section 5.2) makes it possible to initially present all devices capable of responding within the presentation of Figure 4 (i.e. call "********"). Once all devices respond, a user (i.e. a server) can address each and/or all devices by each device's unique ID (i.e. "UgCmVc01",

and "UgCmVc02", etc. – see Suzuki Figure 6 item FROM field in blocks b and c). Suzuki additionally teaches an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot. Suzuki does not specifically disclose menu creation for selecting devices as presently claimed. However, Suzuki teaches presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), thus providing the suggestion of a menu selection presentation, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret the above teachings as menu creation (compare with claim 40 "*a menu generator that creates a menu for individually selecting said devices to activate said controllable function;*", and "*a browser for displaying said menu on a browser based device for a user to individually select each device and activate said controllable function.*"). The inclusion of a menu provides a user of Suzuki the benefit of comparing and contrasting robotic characteristics which aids in a user's decision.

In regard to dependent claim 48, claim 48 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Suzuki, because Suzuki teaches management of networked devices in a room. Since said devices are detected and linked irregardless of end-user intervention, Suzuki's browser interface depicting current device connections suggests autonomous linking/management of said devices, providing Suzuki the benefit of current status of linked devices (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

7. **Claims 14-20, 23-29, 32-38, 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, Teleoperation of multiple robots through the Internet, 5th IEEE International Workshop on Robot and Human Communication, November 11-14, 1996, pages 84-89, in view of Venkatraman et al. (hereinafter Venkatraman), U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 issued September 1999 (referenced in a previous action).**

In regard to dependent claim 14, Suzuki teaches a Web page interface (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's menu, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

In regard to dependent claim 15, Suzuki teaches a web page showing interfacing of networked robot devices (a device link page), said page containing directional control buttons, as well as a Robot Status Panel (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

Suzuki teaches transmission of commands to a robot device, whereby upon completion of a task, said robot sends its own position/image/text data (information contained in a detected device) to be transformed into HTML for presentation in a browser interface (Suzuki page 87 left column – items 3-8, also Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hyperlink for access to said information. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's link page, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

In regard to dependent claim 16, Suzuki teaches a web page showing interfacing of networked robot devices (a device link page), said page containing directional control buttons, as well as a Robot Status Panel (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

Suzuki teaches transmission of commands to a robot device, whereby upon completion of a task, said robot sends its own position/image/text data (information contained in a detected device) to be transformed into

HTML for presentation in a browser interface (Suzuki page 87 left column – items 3-8, also Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hyperlink for access to said information. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's link page, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Suzuki teaches a web page depicting link control and directional buttons (a device link page) regarding identified networked robot devices, said browser web page reflective of an HTML file (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki also teaches a unique ID for each device, comprising group, function, equipment, type and number fields, said information (including information regarding a device's primitive tasks) stored in an Operation Database (i.e. typically an SQL file) (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2.). Suzuki's system uses the database information in rendering said web page/file.

In regard to dependent claim 18, Suzuki teaches a designated unique ID for each robot device, which can be reasonably interpreted as a logical device name, said name stored in a database file, as well as used in rendering a web page/file (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2, also Figures 4, 5).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Suzuki teaches a web page depicting link control and directional buttons (a device link page) regarding identified networked robot devices, said browser web page reflective of an HTML file (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki also teaches a unique ID for each device, comprising group, function, equipment, type and number fields, said information (including information regarding a device's primitive tasks) stored in an Operation Database (i.e. typically an SQL file) (Suzuki page 87 right column – section 5.2.). Suzuki's system retrieves the database information file (including the robot's ID) in rendering said web page/file. Since Suzuki Figure 4 depicts a web page of specific robot images, relevant robot ID references (i.e. its logical device name) must be associated within the underlying HTML file code in order to render said

images. Since the robot ID becomes associated with the "Control Panel for Individual Robot", the control buttons are converted for specific use with a specific referenced robot device (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Suzuki teaches a Web page interface (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink (Venkatraman Abstract, also column 3 lines 17-25, 28-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Venkatraman's embedded device web page within Suzuki's menu, providing a user of Suzuki the benefit of seeing robot specific information (its embedded web page) to aid in decision making.

In regard to dependent claims 23-29, claims 23-29 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 14-20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 21-38, claims 32-38 reflect the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claims 14-20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 41-47, claims 41-47 reflect the system comprising computer executable instructions implemented by the methods as claimed in claims 23-29, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/2004 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on pages 12-13 of the amendment that Suzuki does not teach the claimed limitations of instant claim 13. In particular regard to Applicants comments at bottom of page 12, although it is possible for a user of Suzuki to operate all robot devices simultaneously, said user (via the use of the server) is also capable of querying/directing commands to individual devices via specific unique ID numbers. Although an operator has used wildcards in his query (see Suzuki Figure 6(a)), nevertheless, said operator of Suzuki is fully capable of targeting a specific robot device (i.e. inputting and requesting specific robot ID: UgCmVcO1 – see Suzuki Figure 6(b), 6(c)), if necessary. Whether said targeted device cooperates does not obviate the fact that specific robots can be targeted by an operator to request specific tasks. Further proof can be found via Suzuki's teaching of a user interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user the capability of controlling the direction of an "individual" robot.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the amendment that Suzuki does not teach detecting devices that are currently connected to a (home) network. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Suzuki's presentation (Suzuki Figure 4) requires each participating robot to at least be automatically detected by the network in order to read its status (i.e. active, etc.) in the lower right portion of said Figure 4. Applicant asserts on page 13 that "*In Suzuki, a robot can be connected to the network, without requiring detection of its connection.*". While this may be possibly true in a hardware sense, nevertheless, since the main focus of Suzuki is to communicate with robot devices, detection of available (i.e. currently active) robots is required if communication and cooperation between robots is to occur. The examiner respectfully notes that "*displaying status of a robot*" requires the server to poll said robot over a network for its status.

Applicant asserts on pages 15-20 of the amendment that an operator does not select an individual robot, rather, the Operation Module does, as well as not teaching "creating a menu" for selecting devices. It is respectfully noted that Suzuki's presentation of images from each connected robot, along with a "Dialogue Window" for inputting commands directed to specific devices (Suzuki Figure 4), at least clearly suggests a

menu of robots for interaction with a user. A "menu" in the general sense is merely a listing of available items for selection. Suzuki can at least suggest a menu by its capability to offer a user a list of specific (active) robots for selection (see also Suzuki page 86 column 2, item 2, where it is stated "The operator inputs task commands by selecting items in the menu..."). In addition, Suzuki's teaching of an interface entitled "Control Panel for Individual Robot" (Suzuki page 87 Figure 4), providing a user a "menu" of direction buttons for an "individual" robot.

Applicant argues on page 20 of the amendment that Suzuki is non-analogous art. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, a "home" is a relative term. Suzuki's invention can be applied in any room in any building.

Applicant argues that Suzuki cannot be modified by Venkatraman to place links in Web pages, etc. It is respectfully noted that both references utilize browsers and the Internet (World Wide Web). Suzuki teaches a Web page interface, along with the capability of choosing items via clickable object maps (see Suzuki page 86 column 2, item 1). Suzuki does not specifically teach a hypertext link to a web page contained within a device. However, Venkatraman teaches embedding web access in an appliance, whereby access to user interface functions for a device is attained through a device web page located within said device, said page activated via hyperlink. Said teaching provides more localized specific information displayed to an operator (via Suzuki's graphical interface of Figure 4).

Applicant's arguments on pages 23-29 of the amendment are substantially similar to those previously presented. Accordingly, said arguments have been previously addressed.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this

final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11:30 AM to 8:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on **(703) 305-9792**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

11. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703-872-9306) (for formal/after-final communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

William L. Bashore
Patent Examiner, AU 2176
August 6, 2004